

3535); *v. s. in herb. Mus. Brit.*, mont. Organens. ad Imbuhy (Gardn. 546).

A very distinct species, having straight elongated branches, with axils $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch apart; leaves $1\frac{1}{2}$ – $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches long, $\frac{3}{4}$ –2 inches broad, on a rather stout petiole 2–3 lines long; the terminal panicle is 6 inches long in flower, 8 inches long in fruit, with twenty to twenty-four alternate patent branches 4–6 lines apart, 1–2 inches long, diminishing upwards, bare at base, the lower ones again branched, the upper ones simply spicate; flowers 1 line apart; sepals rather fleshy, very pilose on both sides, $1\frac{1}{4}$ line long; tube of corolla fleshy, contracted in the middle, $1\frac{1}{2}$ line long, its segments $\frac{3}{4}$ –1 line long; anthers cohering in the mouth by their scabrid summits; ovary and style equal, glabrous; stigma short, conical, pilose, sub-2-lobed.

XX.—*On a point relating to the Histology of Rhynchonella.*
By Professor W. KING.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

Glencoir, near Galway,
August 10, 1868.

GENTLEMEN,

Dr. Carpenter, according to his letter inserted in the 'Annals' of this month, has taken it upon himself to "think that the scientific world has a right to know" my "present opinions" on a number of points, which he has written out, pertaining to the genus *Rhynchonella* and some other shells. As regards most of these points, it strikes me that I am not by any means required to notice them: there is one, however, on which, considering the way in which it is represented by Dr. Carpenter, I feel myself called upon to say a few words.

It is quite correct that "some twenty years ago" I was led "to believe that certain very minute dark points, which I observed here and there dispersed over the surface of the valves of various fossil species, were the remains of orifices belonging to extremely minute perforations," and consequently to "doubt the absence" of a perforated structure in any palliobranchiate shell. Now it so happens that ample evidence has long been published by which the "scientific world" is enabled to judge of my "present opinion" on the subject to which my "doubt" applies. In a paper of mine, entitled "Notes on Permian Fossils," which appeared in the 'Annals' of April 1856, I inserted a footnote, containing some remarks on the histology

of *Rhynchonella*, &c., and concluding with the following passage:—

“But let me not forget to acknowledge that I was in error in doubting the absence of perforations ‘in any Brachiopod whatever:’ the account which Dr. Carpenter has given of *Rhynchonella psittacea* in his late chapter* is quite conclusive on this point; but I cannot help thinking, from their occurring in *R. Geinitziana*†, that perforations will yet be found in congeneric species supposed, or stated, to be without them”‡.

The way Dr. Carpenter writes with reference to my voluntarily acknowledged error, also the other “remarks” he has indulged in in his letter, will, I feel assured, be quite sufficient to convince the “scientific world” that, for anything more he can adduce, the “main question” (*i. e.* the “remarkable fact incontestably established”) at issue between us is, as far as we are mutually concerned, now closed,—that, if kept open, it would inevitably degenerate into a mere personal dispute, redundant of reticences, and bolstered up with no end of irrelevant matter.

Yours very truly, &c.

WILLIAM KING.

XXI.—On the Law of Development of the Sexes in Insects.

By Professor VON SIEBOLD§.

THE assertion made by Landois in his preliminary communication¶ that the eggs laid by insects possess no definite traces of the sexual organs, and that the sex of the larvæ is only developed as male and female after their escape from the egg-shell by the influence of difference of food received from without, will not only possess the highest interest for all naturalists who attend to the reproductive history of organic bodies, but, as Landois applies this theory specially to the reproduction of

* Reference is here made to Dr. Carpenter’s memoir “On the Intimate Structure of the Shells of Brachiopoda,” appended to Mr. Davidson’s Monograph of Brit. Foss. Brachiopoda: Introduction. A perusal of my footnote will explain the reason why I only referred to Dr. Carpenter’s “late chapter.”

† The presence of perforations in this species has caused me to regard it as the type of a new genus (*Rhynchopora*) of the family Rhynchonellidæ.

‡ See Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. ser. 2. vol. xvii. p. 337. Even in June (Geological Magazine) of last year I again drew attention to this point, acknowledging “the mistake I made in asserting that certain imperforate Palliobranchs are perforated,” and in “concluding that all Spiriferidæ are perforated.”

§ Translated by W. S. Dallas, F.L.S., from the Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Zoologie, Band xvii. pp. 525–532.

¶ See Zeitschrift für wiss. Zool. xvii. p. 375, and Ann. & Mag. N. H. ser. 3. vol. xix. p. 224.